

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 8 and 15 are amended. Further, the specification and the Abstract has been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicants appreciate and thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 17-33 are allowed and claims 1-16 contain allowable subject matter. For the reasons discussed below, Applicants believe that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks below.

**I.      Objection to the Specification**

The Office Action objects to the Abstract. The Abstract has been amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract is respectfully requested.

**II.     Objection to the Drawings**

The Office Action objects to paragraph [0104]. Paragraph [0104] has been amended to obviate the objection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings (and the specification) is respectfully requested.

**III.    Objection to the Claims**

The Office Action objects to claims 8 and 14 because of formal matters. Claim 8 has been amended to obviate the objection. Regarding claim 14, however, Applicants believe that no correction is needed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 8 and 14 is respectfully requested.

**IV.     Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph**

The Office Action rejects claim 15 as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action considers the phrase "gas type" to be indefinite. Applicants have amended the phrase to recite

"gas" to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

**V.      The Claim Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action provisionally rejects claims 1 and 5-13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 2 and 7-15 of co-pending Application No. 10/656,267.

Applicants understand that this is a provisional rejection. MPEP §804I(B) states that if the provisional double patenting rejection in one application is the only rejection remaining in that application, the Examiner should then withdraw that rejection and permit the application to issue as a patent. Because Applicants believe that, based on the above amendments, the provisional rejection is the only rejection pending in this application. Therefore, the Examiner is urged to place the application in condition for allowance.

**VI.      Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-33 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi  
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/mdw

Date: July 11, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION  
Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461